

East Lake Superior Regional Electricity Planning Webinar – June 4, 2026

Response to feedback received

The IESO hosted a public webinar for the [East Lake Superior](#) electricity plan – Integrated Regional Resource Plan (IRRP) – on June 4, 2026. During the webinar, the IESO shared the detailed options analysis and draft recommendations to meet the region’s future needs for feedback. The presentation materials, including webinar recording, are available on the [Engagement Webpage](#).

The IESO appreciates the feedback received, which will be considered by the Technical Working Group, consisting of the IESO as the lead, the local transmitters (Hydro One Networks Inc. Hydro One Networks Sault Ste. Marie LP., and PUC Services Inc.) and the Local Distribution Companies (Algoma Power Inc., Hydro One Networks Inc., and PUC Services Inc.), to develop the IRRP. Feedback was received from the following parties; the full submission can be viewed on the [Engagement Webpage](#):

- [Ontario Rivers Alliance](#)

The sections below summarize feedback received related to energy priorities and community considerations that should be considered in the East Lake Superior IRRP.

Options Analysis Considerations

Feedback / Common Themes	IESO Response
Ontario Rivers Alliance noted that the identified Algoma 115kV need is driven by the high-growth scenario and recommended clearer alignment between needs, recommendations, and underlying demand scenarios, including consideration of potential ratepayer exposure under lower demand outcomes.	Thank you for this feedback. The identified need at the Algoma 115kV interface is an existing reliability issue and is not driven by forecast growth. Under certain contingency conditions, the system does not meet planning criteria and transmission circuits supplying customers in the Algoma area can become overloaded. This condition is currently managed through a Remedial Action Scheme (RAS). The recommended solution is intended to address this existing issue by enhancing the current RAS and improving its ability to manage these contingency conditions. This approach restores compliance with planning criteria while avoiding more significant transmission reinforcements that are not required at this time. The relationship between the demand scenarios, identified need and recommended solution is illustrated in the June 2026 webinar on slide 19 and 22. These slides show the Reference and High Growth demand forecasts, the capability of the existing infrastructure to meet those forecasts (LMC), and the capability of the system with the draft recommendation implemented (LMC with Recommendation) for the Sault Ste. Marie and Chapleau areas.
Ontario Rivers Alliance expressed concerns that renewable options may be screened out based on inverter-based resource and deliverability limits, noting that the IESO has indicated in the webinar that they are exploring remedies to address these constraints.	The Technical Working Group appreciates this feedback. As shared in the June 2026 webinar, the ability to implement new supply resources in the Sault Ste. Marie area is currently constrained by system conditions, including limits on capacity and restrictions on the integration of certain resource types. As a result, not all supply options are currently feasible at the scale or timing that may be required to address the identified need. The Technical Working Group recommends pursuing a cost-effective supply solution that meets the defined dispatchability, duration, and voltage support requirements to meet the identified near-term supply capacity need. If a resource is acquired through the

Feedback / Common Themes	IESO Response
	Resource Adequacy Framework, the IESO will consider relevant recommendations from regional and bulk planning activities in the surrounding area, including deliverability assessments, could help unlock any constraints and broaden the scope of the procurement needs. This recommendation is intended to be technology-neutral and will aim to ensure that any possible acquired resource can meet the reliability needs in the region.
Ontario Rivers Alliance expressed concerns that the proposed criteria for dispatchable generation may constrain consideration of alternative resource options, and recommends a technology-neutral evaluation framework, including: • Evaluate wind, solar, storage and hybrid resources on the firm-capacity basis established by the IESO's Hybrid Resource Equivalency Assessment. • Share the gross capital cost and the net cost, calculated on the same basis, for every option. • Do not adopt operational criteria (non-energy-limited, always-available fuel) that may predetermine a new fossil-gas plant for the Sault Ste. Marie area. • Maximize electricity demand side management, Save on Energy programs and energy storage to defer and reduce the need before committing to any new generation. • Stress-test new generation against the Ontario Provincial Climate Change Impact Assessment.	Thank you for this feedback. The IRRP's recommendations are informed by an evaluation of both wire and non-wire options and combinations of these facilities (hybrid resources) to meet identified system needs. Options are assessed based on reliability, cost, technical feasibility, maximizing the use of the existing electricity system (where economic), and feedback from communities and other interested parties. For more details regarding the analysis of alternatives, including planning-level estimates for costs, the IESO has developed a guide to the current general approach for evaluating non wires alternatives (NWAs) during IRRPs, which is consistent with the IESO's Hybrid Resource Equivalency Assessment. In the Sault Ste. Marie area, under certain contingencies, the system experiences voltage stability limitations and requires a solution that can provide voltage support during infrequent and unpredictable operating conditions. The assessment did not begin with a predetermined technology or fuel type but focused on identifying options capable of meeting the required reliability and voltage support objectives. The options analysis found that dispatchable generation can provide the necessary voltage support during these events. Alternative solutions were also evaluated. For example, a wind and storage hybrid facility was evaluated but was not considered feasible in this case as a very large facility would be required to meet the need and the existing system cannot

Feedback / Common Themes	IESO Response
	support a project of the required size. The addition of a third autotransformer station was also evaluated and would meet the need while improving long-term system resilience, although it would involve a higher overall system cost. Based on this evaluation, the recommended solution reflects the option that balances reliability, technical performance, cost, and overall system conditions rather than the application of criteria intended to favour a specific technology.

Draft Recommendations

Feedback / Common Themes	IESO Response
Ontario Rivers Alliance supports the recommendations to meet needs in the Chapleau Area and the Algoma interface, highlighting the use of cost-effective, right-sized non-wires solutions and targeted system enhancements in place of more costly infrastructure investments.	The Technical Working Group appreciates this feedback.

Planned Engagement

Feedback / Common Themes	IESO Response
Ontario Rivers Alliance recommended greater coordination and transparency with next steps on the Sault Ste. Marie generation recommendation, specifically: • Hosting an engagement before procuring generation. • Including cumulative ratepayer impact given its overlap with the Sudbury/Algoma IRRP and the Long Lead-Time Procurement.	The Technical Working Group appreciates this feedback. The Technical Working Group is recommending pursuing a cost-effective supply solution that meets the defined dispatchability, duration, and voltage support requirements to address the identified near-term supply capacity need. There is potential to procure this resource through the IESO's Resource Adequacy Framework, provided the need could be satisfied while still meeting all applicable requirements of the procurement and resulting contractual performance obligations. The Resource Adequacy Framework is technology-agnostic and designed to secure resources that can meet the operational requirements of the identified need, and provincial resource adequacy requirements, through a

Feedback / Common Themes	IESO Response
	competitive procurement process. Stakeholder engagement and consultation is important to the IESO, and feedback is gathered from the sector to ensure the details of upcoming procurements are fair and understood. The electricity needs identified for East Lake Superior are geographically and electrically localized and do not overlap with the Sudbury/Algoma IRRP. As the Sudbury/Algoma IRRP progresses, it'll assess the infrastructure for electricity needs and identify if there are overlaps at the regional and bulk level.
Ontario Rivers Alliance inquired about how feedback changed the draft recommendations.	Thank you for this question. Through the IRRP engagement process, the Technical Working Group received valuable feedback on community priorities, growth projections and local considerations. These inputs were incorporated throughout the development of the electricity demand forecast scenarios and screening of options to meet the identified infrastructure needs, ultimately informing the draft recommendations. Feedback received in the engagement process highlighted the growing regional demand, challenges in exporting generation in the area and the interest in expansion of new renewable generation. The study considered costs of renewable congestion in the area and the ability to offset those costs with investments in the area. These findings informed the draft recommendation and highlighted areas of interest for future studies in the region. The IESO evaluates wire and non-wire options against a consistent set of criteria, including technical feasibility, effectiveness in meeting the identified need, cost-effectiveness, implementation timing, and community considerations. Community feedback is an important input to this process and helps inform the evaluation and refinement of options.